

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to specify that the optical film being capable of attachment to a glass substrate without substantial foam entry, and new claim 25 has been added, which is directed to a method of laminating the optical film of claim 1, comprising applying the optical film to a substrate whereby substantial foam entry is prevented.

Support for the added recitations is found in the original application, for example on page 14, lines 12-20.

As a preliminary, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank the Examiner for the personal interview which was held on October 10, 2004.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-8, 17-18, and 21-22 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to an optical film. Independent claim 9, and claims 10-16, 19-20, and 23-24 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a liquid crystal display. Claim 25 is directed to a method of laminating the optical film of claim 1.

In the Office Action, claims 1-24 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,088,079 to Kameyama et al. (Kameyama) in view of JP 09-113727 to Nakajima et al. (Nakajima). In summary, it is admitted in the Office Action that Kameyama does not suggest the flexural rigidity of the present invention, but it is alleged that Nakajima teaches adjusting the flexural rigidity of an optical film, so that the claimed property would have been obvious optimization "depending on the desired end use of the product."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. As recited in the claims, the optical film of the presently claimed invention is capable of attachment to a glass

substrate without substantial foam entry. As discussed during the personal interview, it is submitted that the prior art had not recognized a connection between a foaming problem at the time of laminating and a flexural rigidity of the optical film. Consequently, there would have been no motivation to modify or combine the cited references as alleged in the Office Action. In other words, adjusting the flexural rigidity of the optical film appears easy only in hindsight, after the problems of workability and foaming have been (i) identified, and (ii) correlated to the flexural rigidity of the optical film.

In particular, as discussed in the previous submission, Nakajima correlates the elasticity E of a protective layer with thermal contraction phenomena (see paragraphs [0014]-[0015]). Thus, the teachings of Nakajima are limited to a single layer protective film and apply to a dimensional change problem that occurs during use of a display and not at the time of assembling the display. In contrast, the present inventors have identified the flexural rigidity of the optical film as the variable to be adjusted so as to solve the problems of “foaming” and “workability” by unexpectedly preventing substantial foam entry, as recited in the present claims. This feature of the presently claimed invention is not taught or suggested in any of the cited references.

In summary, the flexural rigidity feature of the optical film as defined in the present claims could not have been taught or suggested by Nakajima because Nakajima is silent as to the foaming problem and as to adjusting the flexural rigidity accordingly. Thus, Nakajima does not provide any motivation to modify the flexural rigidity of the optical element of Kameyama, so that it does not remedy the deficiencies of Kameyama. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over any combination of these references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020591
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 822-1100
Fax: (202) 822-1111
Customer No.: 38834
NES:rep